



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/512,411	02/24/2000	Xiaobao Chen	3-2-2	5744

22046 7590 06/25/2004

LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.  
DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR  
101 CRAWFORDS CORNER ROAD - ROOM 3J-219  
HOLMDEL, NJ 07733

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 06/25/2004

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/512,411

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Tammy T Nguyen

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

## Detailed Office Action

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on April 2, 2004.
2. Claim 1-19 are pending

### *Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2143

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by La Porta et al. (USPN 6,654,359 – Date of Patent: November 25, 2003, herein referred to as “La Porta”)

5. As to claim 1, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of establishing a quality of service session between a correspondent node and a mobile node, the mobile node having a home address in a home network and being temporarily connected at a care-of address in a foreign network, the method comprising the steps of:

generating, in the foreign network, a modified reply message having a source address of the mobile node's care-of address and a destination address of the correspondent node (col.5, lines 43-52, col.32, lines 25-49); and

transmitting the modified reply message (col.5, lines 52-55).

6. As to claim 2, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising the steps of: receiving, in the home network, a request message having a source address of the correspondent node and a destination address of the mobile node's home address ();

creating a modified request message by replacing the destination address of the request message with the mobile node's care-of address (col.1, lines 39-47); and

transmitting the modified request message to the foreign network, whereby the modified reply message is generated responsive to the modified request message (col.1, lines 25-38, col.16, lines 46-65).

7. As to claim 5, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising the steps of: receiving, in the home network, the modified reply message (col.34, lines 9-12);

Art Unit: 2143

creating a further modified reply message by replacing the source address with the mobile node's home address (col.34, lines 19-23); and

transmitting the further modified reply message (col.33,lines 51-56).

8. As to claim 6, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the correspondent node generates the request message and receives the further modified reply message (col.34, lines 49-55).

9. As to claim 8, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of generating the modified reply message is carried out in the mobile node (col.34, lines 19-25).

10. As to claim 9, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of generating the modified reply message comprises:

generating a reply message having a source address of the mobile node's home address and a destination address of the correspondent node (col.37, lines 29-33, col.34, lines 18-25, and col.5, lines 42-55); and

replacing the source address with the mobile node's care-of address, thereby generating the modified reply message (col.5, lines 43-56, and col.34, lines 9-35).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2143

12. Claims 3,7, 10, 12-14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over La Porta et al., (hereinafter La Porta) U.S. Patent No. 6,654,359 in view of Willkie et al., (hereinafter Willkie) U.S. Patent No. 6,230,012.

13. As to claim 3, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of generating the modified reply message is carried out further comprising the steps of:

responsive to receipt of the modified request message, sending a quality of service indication signal to the mobile node, whereby the modified reply message is generated responsive to receipt of a quality of service acknowledgment from the mobile node (col.32, lines 49-56).

La Porta does not explicitly teach a proxy device, in the foreign network, the proxy device associated with the mobile node. However, Willkie teaches a proxy device, in the foreign network, the proxy device associated with mobile node (col.5, lines 10-15, col.6, lines 12-14, and col.7, lines 60-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of La Porta and Willkie to have a proxy device, in the foreign network and associated with mobile node because it would have an utilization and convenient system that can dramatically improve performance for groups of users and much faster operation than pulling the same information more than once.

14. As to claim 7, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, wherein:  
generates the request message responsive to a quality of service request from the correspondent node (col.33, lines 49-56); and  
generates a quality of service confirmation responsive to receipt of the further modified reply message (col.32, lines 49-56)

Art Unit: 2143

La Porta does not explicitly teach a proxy device, the proxy device associated with the mobile node. However, Willkie teaches a proxy device, the proxy device associated with mobile node (col.5, lines 10-15, col.6, lines 12-14, and col.7, lines 60-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of La Porta and Willkie to have a proxy device, the proxy associated with mobile node because it would have an utilization and convenient system that can dramatically improve performance for groups of users and much faster operation than pulling the same information more than once.

15. As to claim 10, La Porta does not explicitly teach a proxy device, the proxy device associated with the mobile node. However, Willkie teaches a proxy device, the proxy device associated with mobile node (col.5, lines 10-15, col.6, lines 12-14, and col.7, lines 60-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of La Porta and Willkie to have a proxy device, the proxy associated with mobile node because it would have an utilization and convenient system that can dramatically improve performance for groups of users and much faster operation than pulling the same information more than once.

16. As to claim 12, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, including a mobile IP environment capable of supporting a quality of service session, comprising:

a correspondent node (col.34, lines 9-10);

a mobile node having a home address in a home network and being temporarily connected at a care-of address in a foreign network (col.37, lines 29-33, col.34, lines 18-25, and col.5, lines 42-55);

Art Unit: 2143

generating a modified reply message having a source address of the mobile node's care-of address and a destination address of the correspondent node (col.5, lines 43-56, and col.34, lines 9-35).

La Porta does not explicitly teach a proxy device, in the foreign network, the proxy device associated with the mobile node. However, Willkie teaches a proxy device, in the foreign network, the proxy device associated with mobile node (col.5, lines 10-15, col.6, lines 12-14, and col.7, lines 60-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of La Porta and Willkie to have a proxy device, in the foreign network and associated with mobile node because it would have an utilization and convenient system that can dramatically improve performance for groups of users and much faster operation than pulling the same information more than once.

17. As to claim 13, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the proxy device is located in the mobile node (col.5, lines 11-15).

18. As to claim 14, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed wherein the proxy device is located outside the mobile node and coupled to the mobile node (col.3, lines 42-47).

19. As to claim 16, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, including a system capable of supporting a quality of service session, comprising:

a correspondent node (col.34, lines 9-10);

a mobile node having a home address in a home network and being temporarily connected at a care-of address in a foreign network (col.37, lines 29-33, col.34, lines 18-25, and col.5, lines 42-55);



Art Unit: 2143

generating a modified reply message having a source address of the mobile node's care-of address and a destination address of the correspondent node (col.5, lines 43-56, and col.34, lines 9-35).

La Porta does not explicitly teach a proxy device, in the foreign network, the proxy device associated with the mobile node. However, Willkie teaches a proxy device, in the foreign network, the proxy device associated with mobile node (col.5, lines 10-15, col.6, lines 12-14, and col.7, lines 60-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of La Porta and Willkie to have a proxy device, in the foreign network and associated with mobile node because it would have an utilization and convenient system that can dramatically improve performance for groups of users and much faster operation than pulling the same information more than once.

20. As to claim 17, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the proxy device is located in the mobile node (col.5, lines 11-15).

21. As to claim 18, La Porta teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the proxy device is located outside the mobile node and coupled to the mobile node (col.3, lines 42-47).

22. Claims 4, 11, 15, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over La Porta et al., (hereinafter La Porta) U.S. Patent No. 6,654,359, and Willkie et al., (hereinafter Willkie) U.S. Patent No. 6,230,012 in view of Kidder et al., (hereinafter Kidder) U. S. Patent No. 5,903,735.

23. As claim 4, La Porta and Willkie do not explicitly teach the quality of service session is an RSVP Message, the request message is a Path message and the modified reply message is a Reservation message. However, Lazaridis teaches the quality of service session is an RSVP

Art Unit: 2143

session (col.7, line 55-col.8, line 17); the request message is a Path message (col.8, lines 3-17, col.8, lines 49-65, and col.10, lines 22-38); and the modified reply message is a Reservation message (col.8, lines 3-17, and col.9, lines 17-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of La Porta, Willkie and Kidder to have an RSVP, Path and Reservation message session includes in a communication system because it would have an efficient system that provide a remote receiver requests that a certain amount of bandwidth be reserved by the server for a data stream; the server sends back a message indicating whether or not the request has been granted.

24. Claims 11, 15, and 19 have similar limitations as claim 4; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

25. Applicant's arguments filed on April 2, 2004 have been fully considered, however they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

26. Applicants argue that La Porta does not teach generating a modified reply message having a source address of the mobile node's care-of address and a destination address of the correspondent node. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintain the rejection because La Porta does teach generating a modified reply message having a source address of the mobile node's care-of address and a destination address of the correspondent node as shown in col.32, lines 25-49 show generating a modify reply message by an updating message to the base station, and the reply message also having a source IP address field is set to the IP

Art Unit: 2143

address of the current base station and the destination IP address field is set to the IP address of the domain root router.

27. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 12, and 16. Claims 2-11, 13-15 and 17-19 are also rejected at least by the virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in the previous office action [see paper no. 12].

28. Accordingly, claims 1-19 are respectfully rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

29. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

30. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from

Art Unit: 2143

the examiner should be directed to **Tammy T. Nguyen** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 305-7982**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding this instant application, please send it to **(703) 872-9306**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Bill Cuchlinski, may be reached at **(703) 308-3873**.

*TTN*

June 21, 2004



WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600